REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 14-21 remain in the present application. Claims 14-21 are added herein. Claim 1-3 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments and additions. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the amendments and arguments set forth below.

Examiner Interview Summary

On June 22, 2006, the Applicants' representatives, Anthony Murabito and Bryan Failing conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner. Claims 1-2 and the cited prior art Chujoh et al. were discussed. It was agreed that the instant response and amendment would be submitted by the Applicant for reconsideration of the above captioned patent application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,256,064 to Chujoh et al. (hereafter referred to as "Chujoh"). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-5 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Chujoh for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, which recites a method of processing a signal comprising (emphasis added):

> a) reading a first bit section from a bit stream of variable length codes beginning at a reference bit of said bit stream, <u>wherein said reading a first bit section is performed in a given direction</u>;

b) reading a second bit section from said bit stream beginning at a first offset from said reference bit of said bit, <u>wherein said reading a second bit section is performed in said given direction</u>, wherein steps a) and b) are done in parallel, and <u>wherein said first offset is less than a minimum symbol length</u>;

c) indexing a table with said first bit section to obtain a first look-up result, said table comprising a plurality of variable length codes and a corresponding plurality of code lengths, said first look-up result describing the length of a first symbol in said bit stream;

d) indexing said table with said second bit section to obtain a second look-up result, wherein steps c) and d) are done in parallel;

e) determining if said second look-up result from step d) is valid; and

f) accepting said second look-up result if it is valid, wherein said second look-up result describes a second symbol length in said bit stream.

Claims 2-5 depend from independent Claim 1 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that Chujoh fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said reading a first bit section is performed in a given direction," "wherein said reading a second bit section is performed in said given direction" at a first offset form the first bit section, and "wherein said first offset is less than a minimum symbol length" as recited in independent Claim 1. As described in the present application and shown in Figure 6B, a first bit section (e.g., "A_0") and a second bit section (e.g., "A_1") of a bit stream (e.g., 680) are read in the same direction. The first and second bit sections are offset by a first offset, where the first offset is less than a minimum symbol length (e.g., three bits as shown in Table 302), thereby presenting a reading *overlap* of the first and second bit sections.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Chujoh to teach subsequent decoding with an offset of greater than a minimum symbol length such that *no reading overlap* of bit sections is present. For example, as shown in Figure 34(b), gaps are present between subsequently decoded bit

sections (e.g., as shown by arrows), thereby preventing any reading overlap as discussed above. As such, even assuming arguendo that the bit sections are read in parallel as claimed, the offset shown in Figure 34(b) is greater than a minimum symbol length such that there are gaps between the decoded sections rather than an overlap caused by the offset being less than the symbol length as claimed. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Chujoh fails to teach or suggest an offset between bit sections of less than a minimum symbol length as claimed.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that Chujoh fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "advancing the reference bit of said bit stream by the sum of said first and second symbol lengths" as recited in Claim 2. As described and claimed in the present application, a reference bit of a bit stream is advanced by the sum of the first and second symbol lengths.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Chujoh to teach decoding data in both forward and backward directions, where the forward and backward bit streams are advanced by a single macro block in each respective direction (Figure 27; col. 20, lines 13-26). Applicants respectfully assert that the length of a macro block is very different from a symbol length as claimed. Moreover, even assuming arguendo that a length of a macro block as taught by Chujoh is analogous to a symbol length as claimed, Applicants respectfully assert that Chujoh effectively <u>teaches away</u> from the claimed embodiments by teaching advancing both the forward and backward decoding by a *single* macro block in *opposite* directions. As such, since the decoding is performed in opposite directions on the same bit stream as taught by Chujoh, the

net advancement of the stream is *zero* instead of the sum of a first and second symbol length as claimed.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that Chujoh fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said first offset is equal to the minimum code length of codes in said table" as recited in Claim 4. As described in the present application, a second bit section is read beginning at a first offset from a reference bit.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, the rejection cites the teaching of a single macro block as analogous to a first offset equal to a minimum length of codes in a table. Applicants respectfully assert that such a teaching of a bit stream comprising macro blocks is very different from a first offset equal to the minimum code length of codes in a code table as claimed. Moreover, even assuming arguendo that the minimum code length of codes within a code table is a single macro block, Chujoh effectively teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching that the offset (e.g., the starting points of forward and backward decoding) is *more than one* macro block (Figure 27).

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Chujoh, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections of record. Since Claims 2-5 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in independent Claim 1, Claims 2-5 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections of record. Thus, Claims 1-5 are therefore allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Chujoh. Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 6-8 are neither not rendered obvious by Chujoh since Claims 6-8 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in independent Claim 1. Thus, Claims 6-8 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record, and are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-8 and 14-21 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: _6/27_, 2006　　　　　BMF
_____

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060